



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,379	05/10/2000	XANDER VAN DER HEUDEN	BO 41504	7020

466 7590 10/01/2003

YOUNG & THOMPSON  
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	70

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/529,379	VAN DER HEIJDEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christian La Forgia	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 28-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 28-56 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on 07 July 2003 is noted and made of record.
2. Claims 1 through 56 are presented for examination.
3. Claims 1 through 27 have been cancelled as per Applicant's request.

### *Drawings*

4. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings.
5. The Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. See 1017 O.G. 4. It is applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections must be made in accordance with the instructions below.

## **INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

### **Replacement Drawing Sheets**

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement figures which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments, or remarks, section of the amendment. Any replacement drawing sheet must be identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet" and include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin.

### **Annotated Drawing Sheets**

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheets must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Marked-up Drawings" and accompany the replacement sheets.

### **Timing of Corrections**

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

### ***Specification***

6. A substitute specification including the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR

1.125(a) because it appears to be a direct translation and is not in proper idiomatic

English.

7. A substitute specification filed under 37 CFR 1.125(a) must only contain subject

matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37

CFR 1.121. If the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of

record, the substitute specification must be filed under 37 CFR 1.125(b) and (c)

8. A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37

CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied

by a statement that it contains no new matter.

### ***Priority***

9. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application filed in Europe on 13 October 1997. A

claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter.<sup>9</sup> The foreign priority claim filed on 10 May 2000 was not entered because the foreign priority claim was not filed during the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.55(a)(1). For original applications filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) (other than a design application) on or after November 29, 2000, the time period is during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior foreign application. For applications that have entered national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the claim for priority must be made during the pendency of the application and within the time limit set forth in the PCT and the Regulations under the PCT. See 37 CFR 1.55(a)(1)(ii). If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), (f) or 365(a) based upon a prior foreign application, applicant must file a petition for an unintentionally delayed priority claim (37 CFR 1.55(c)). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the claim (i.e., the claim required by 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) and (f) and 37 CFR 1.55) for priority to the prior foreign application, unless previously submitted; (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t); and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.55(a)(1) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26 through 55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
11. See further rejections that follow.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
13. Regarding claims 28, 37, and 56, the phrase "at least" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "at least"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
14. Regarding claims 30 and 39, the phrase "like mail, business message, orders for shipping" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
15. Regarding claim 46, the phrase "e.g. (Latin for *exempli gratia* loosely translated to mean for example" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2131

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 28 through 37 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,018,766 to Samuel et al., hereinafter Samuel, in lieu of obviousness.
18. As per claim 28, Samuel teaches a method of point-to-point communication between a sender (SRV(m)) and a receiver (SRV(m)) by means of messages with flexible message formats (ILMF), the messages each comprising:

a header at least comprising message definition references (MSG ID, MSG CLASS, MSG VERSION, MSG CREATOR), a sender identifier (SENDER ID) and a destination address (DESTINATION ADDRESS) (Figure 9 [blocks 117, 123, 125]; column 13, line 64 to column 14, line 3);

message content including at least:

number of fields (FIELD COUNT) and content of any field (FIELD(1), . . .) (Figure 9 [block 116]; column 14, lines 37-50);

characterized in that the message content also comprises:

number of objects (OBJECT COUNT) and content of any object (OBJECT (1), . . .), the objects being referred to by one or more of the fields (Figure 9 [blocks 117, 118, 119]; column 14, lines 37-50);

number of field mappings and content of any field mapping, any field mapping being usable by predetermined fields (Figure 9 [blocks 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122]; column 14, lines 37-50);

number of actions and content of any actions, any action being at least usable by predetermined fields (Figure 9 [blocks 116, 124]; column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 24; column 14, lines 37-50);

and in that the method further includes the step of:

interpreting and processing any of the messages using a database (ILMDB) storing a message definition table (msgdef), a field definition table (flddef), mapping instructions (fldmap) and message action lists (fldact, msgpre, msgpost) (Figure 10, 11; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13; column 22, line 56 to column 23, line 7; column 23, lines 9-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the various fields in the content (or payload) of Samuel. One would be motivated to include such a function as to hasten the processing of datagrams or messages. As it has been seen with the latest technology, the increase in demand for quicker Internet access has led to a demand in methods to interpret datagrams or messages as quick as possible, by adding the aforementioned fields to Samuel would create a quicker method to interpret and process incoming and outgoing datagrams or messages. Furthermore, Samuel may not teach the fields in the exact order as the instant application, and the Examiner contests that it would still be obvious as all the components are there, their location has just been shifted, see *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 8 USPQ 70, 73 (CCPA 1950).

19. Regarding claim 29, Samuel teaches, wherein the message definition references comprise a message identifier (MSG ID) for identifying any of the messages (Figure 9

[block 124]; column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 24; column 16, line 64 to column 17, line 13).

20. Regarding claim 30, Samuel teaches, wherein the message definition references comprise a message class identifier (MSG CLASS) for identifying a message class for any of the messages, like mail, business message, orders or shipping (Figure 9 [block 124]; column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 24).

21. Regarding claim 31, Samuel teaches, wherein the message definition references comprise a message version identifier (MSG VERSION) for identifying a version number of any of the messages (Figure 9 [block 116]; column 14, lines 37-50).

22. Regarding claim 32, Samuel teaches, wherein the message definition references comprise a message creator identifier (MSG CREATOR) for identifying a creator of any of the messages (Figure 9 [block 117]; column 14, lines 37-50).

23. Regarding claim 33, Samuel teaches, wherein the header comprises a reference to a type of encryption (ENCRYPTION TYPE) applied (column 12, lines 46 to column 13, line 13). Since Samuel teaches encapsulating the Upper Level Protocol in a Transport Level Protocol, wherein one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize IP as a Transport Level Protocol, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the header comprises a reference to a type of encryption. For further explanation please reference Figures 7.3, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, & 13.7; page 107, **7.8 Internet Datagram Options** to page 109, **7.8.1**

**Record Route Option of Douglas Comer's *Internetworking with TCP/IP Principles, Protocols and Architectures*.**

24. Regarding claim 34, Samuel teaches, wherein the header comprises a reference to a type of compression (COMPRESSION TYPE) applied (column 12, lines 46 to column 13, line 13; column 26, lines 51-61). Since Samuel teaches encapsulating the Upper Level Protocol in a Transport Level Protocol, wherein one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize IP as a Transport Level Protocol, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the header comprises a reference to a type of encryption. For further explanation please reference Figures 7.3, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, & 13.7; page 107, **7.8 Internet Datagram Options** to page 109, **7.8.1 Record Route Option** of Douglas Comer's *Internetworking with TCP/IP Principles, Protocols and Architectures*.

25. Regarding claim 35, Samuel teaches, wherein the header comprises a reference to an application (APPLICATION NAME) for indicating whether or not any of the messages is member of a series of messages forming together the application (Abstract; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13).

26. Regarding claim 36, Samuel does not teach wherein any of the messages comprises a digital signature. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to teach wherein any of the messages comprises a digital signature. One would be motivated to include a digital signature in order to verify a sender's identity. With the increase in malicious computer attacks a digital signature

would be a small step in authenticating the true identity of the user and thereby making the communication thread that much more secure.

27. As per claim 37, Samuel teaches a communication apparatus comprising processing means (ILMS) and a database (ILMDB), arranged for point-to-point communication with another communication apparatus (SRV(m)) by means of messages with flexible message formats (ILMF), the messages comprising:

a header at least comprising message definition references (MSG ID, MSG CLASS, MSG VERSION, MSG CREATOR), a sender identifier (SENDER ID) and a destination address (DESTINATION ADDRESS) (Figure 9 [blocks 117, 123, 125]; column 13, line 64 to column 14, line 3);

message content including at least:

number of fields (FIELD COUNT) and content of any field (FIELD (1), . . .) (Figure 9 [block 116]; column 14, lines 37-50);

characterized in that the message content also comprises:

number of objects (OBJECT COUNT) and content of any object (OBJECT(1), . . .), the objects being referred to by one or more of the fields (Figure 9 [blocks 117, 118, 119]; column 14, lines 37-50);

number of field mappings and content of any field mapping, any field mapping being usable by predetermined fields (Figure 9 [blocks 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122]; column 14, lines 37-50);

number of actions and content of any actions, any action being at least usable by predetermined fields (Figure 9 [blocks 116, 124]; column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 24; column 14, lines 37-50);

and in that the database (ILMDB) stores a predetermined message definition table (msgdef), a field definition table (flddef), mapping instructions (fldmap) and message action lists (fldact, msgpre, msgpost) (Figure 10, 11; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13; column 22, line 56 to column 23, line 7; column 23, lines 9-29);

and in that the processing means (ILMS) is arranged to interpret and process messages while consulting the predetermined message definition table (msgdef), mapping instructions (fldmap) and message action lists (fldact, msgpre, msgpost) stored in the database (ILMDB) using the message definition references as references to the predetermined message definitions (Figure 10, 11; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13; column 22, line 56 to column 23, line 7; column 23, lines 9-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the various fields in the content (or payload) of Samuel. One would be motivated to include such a function as to hasten the processing of datagrams or messages. As it has been seen with the latest technology, the increase in demand for quicker Internet access has led to a demand in methods to interpret datagrams or messages as quick as possible, by adding the aforementioned fields to Samuel would create a quicker method to interpret and process incoming and outgoing datagrams or messages. Furthermore, Samuel may not teach the fields in the exact order as the instant

application, and the Examiner contests that it would still be obvious as all the components are there, their location has just been shifted, see *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 8 USPQ 70, 73 (CCPA 1950).

28. As per claim 56, Samuel teaches a method of point-to-point communication between a sender (SRV(m)) and a receiver (SRV(m)), comprising the steps of:

sending messages with flexible message formats (ILMF), the messages comprising:

a header at least comprising message definition references including a message identifier (MSG ID), a message class designation (MSG CLASS), a message version (MSG VERSION), a message creator identifier (MSG CREATOR), a sender identifier (SENDER ID) and a destination address (DESTINATION ADDRESS) (Figure 9 [blocks 117, 123, 125]; column 13, line 64 to column 14, line 3);

a message content portion, the message content portion including a field count field indicating a number of message fields in the message, and plural fields of message content (Figure 9 [block 116]; column 14, lines 37-50),

each of the fields of message content comprising a field data description portion and a data portion (Figure 9; column 13, line 58 to column 14, line 50);

an object count portion, the object count portion including a object count field indicating a number of object in the message, followed by object data fields (Figure 9 [blocks 117, 118, 119]; column 14, lines 37-50);

a field mapping portion, the field mapping portion including a mapping count field indicating a number of maps in the message, followed by mapping data fields (Figure 9 [blocks 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122]; column 14, lines 37-50);

a actions portion, the actions portion including an actions count field indicating a number of action included in the message, followed by action data fields (Figure 9 [blocks 116, 124]; column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 24; column 14, lines 37-50; column 16, line 63 to column 17, line 13); and,

interpreting and processing any of said messages using a data base (ILMB) storing a message definition table (msgdef), a field definition table (flddef), mapping instructions (fldmap) and message action lists (fldact, msgpre, msgpost) (Figure 10, 11; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13; column 22, line 56 to column 23, line 7; column 23, lines 9-29), wherein,

the message class designation include a mail message, a business message, an order message, and a shipping message (Abstract; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13),

the field data description portion comprises a data type identifier, a size vaule, a field name, and field label, and a field description (Figure 9; column 13, line 58 to column 14, line 50), and

the mapping data fields comprise a field identifier, a mapping type, and mapping data (Figure 9; column 13, line 58 to column 14, line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the various fields in the content (or payload) of Samuel. One would be motivated to include such a function as to hasten the processing of datagrams or messages. As it has been seen with

the latest technology, the increase in demand for quicker Internet access has led to a demand in methods to interpret datagrams or messages as quick as possible, by adding the aforementioned fields to Samuel would create a quicker method to interpret and process incoming and outgoing datagrams or messages. Furthermore, Samuel may not teach the fields in the exact order as the instant application, and the Examiner contests that it would still be obvious as all the components are there, their location has just been shifted, see *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 8 USPQ 70, 73 (CCPA 1950).

29. Claims 38 through 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samuel in view of United States Patent No. 5,960,178 to Cochinwala et al., hereinafter Cochinwala.

30. With regards to claim 38, Samuel does not teach wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message identifier (msgid) for identifying any of the messages.

31. Cochinwala teaches, wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message identifier (msgid) for identifying any of the messages (Figures 2 [block 300], 3 [block 400], 4 [block 500], 5 [block 602]; column 3, lines 33-43; column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 5; column 4, lines 21-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the message definition table into the system of Samuel. One would be motivated to include such a table because of the increase in demand for faster Internet access has led to a demand in methods to interpret datagrams or messages as quick as possible, by adding

Art Unit: 2131

the aforementioned fields to Samuel would create a quicker method to interpret and process incoming and outgoing datagrams or messages.

32. With regards to claim 39, Samuel does not teach wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message class identifier (msgclass) for identifying a message class for any of the messages, like mail, business message, orders for shipping.

33. Cochinwala teaches wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message class identifier (msgclass) for identifying a message class for any of the messages, like mail, business message, orders for shipping (Figure 2 [block 304], 3 [block 214]; column 3, liens 43-57; column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the message definition table into the system of Samuel. One would be motivated to include such a table because of the increase in demand for faster Internet access has led to a demand in methods to interpret datagrams or messages as quick as possible, by adding the aforementioned fields to Samuel would create a quicker method to interpret and process incoming and outgoing datagrams or messages.

34. With regards to claim 40, Samuel does not teach wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message version identifier (msgver) for identifying a version number of any of the messages.

35. Cochinwala teaches, wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message version identifier (msgver) for identifying a version

Art Unit: 2131

number of any of the messages (Figures 2, 3, 4; column 3, lines 33-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a message version identifier in the message definition table. One would be motivated to include such a field, as it would aid in hastening the processing of the message, thereby minimizing the time the apparatus holds onto the message.

36. With regards to claim 41, Samuel does not teach wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message creator identifier (creatid) for identifying a creator of any of the messages message creator identifier (MSG CREATOR) for identifying a creator of any of the messages.

37. Cochinwala teaches wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message creator identifier (creatid) for identifying a creator of any of the messages message creator identifier (MSG CREATOR) for identifying a creator of any of the messages (Figures 2, 3, 4; column 3, lines 33-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a message creator in the message definition table. One would be motivated to include such a field, as it would aid in hastening the processing of the message, thereby minimizing the time the apparatus holds onto the message.

38. With regards to claim 42, Samuel does not teach wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a reference to a type of encryption (encrtype) applied.

Art Unit: 2131

39. Cochinwala teaches wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a reference to a type of encryption (encrtype) applied (Figures 2, 3, 4; column 3, lines 33-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a type of encryption identifier in the message definition table. One would be motivated to include such a field, as it would aid in hastening the processing of the message, thereby minimizing the time the apparatus holds onto the message.

40. With regards to claim 43, Samuel does not teach wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a reference to a digital signature type (sigtype) applied.

41. Cochinwala teaches wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a reference to a digital signature type (sigtype) applied (Figures 2, 3, 4; column 3, lines 33-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a digital signature identifier in the message definition table. One would be motivated to include such a field, as it would aid in hastening the processing of the message, thereby minimizing the time the apparatus holds onto the message.

42. With regards to claim 44, Cochinwala teaches, wherein the predetermined message definition table (msgdef) comprises a message system identifier (msysid) for use as a reference to further tables in the database (ILMDB) (Figure 2 [block 302], 4 [block 502]; column 3, lines 33-57; column 4, lines 6-21).

43. Concerning claim 45, Samuel teaches wherein the further tables comprise a field definition table (flddef) for holding primary definitions for any field of the messages (Figure 10 [block 139]; column 16, lines 17-35).

44. Concerning claim 46, Samuel teaches wherein the further tables comprise a field mapping table (fldmap) comprising the mapping instructions usable by predetermined fields, e.g. for mappings to hyper text markup language fields, database fields, flat file fields and other message fields, the database fields and flat file fields being stored in a customer database (CDB) (Figure 10 [block 139]; column 16, lines 17-35).

45. Concerning claim 47, Samuel teaches wherein the further tables comprise a field action table (fldact) comprising the message action lists usable by predetermined fields (Figure 10 [block 139]; column 16, lines 17-35).

46. Concerning claim 48, Samuel teaches wherein the further tables comprise a message preprocessing table (msgpre) comprising a list of actions to be executed as pre-processing for a message either received or to be send and a message post-processing (msgpost) comprising a list of action to be executed as post-processing for a message received ( column 13, line 58 to column 14, line 36; column 16, line 63 to column 17, line 13).

47. Concerning claim 49, Samuel teaches wherein the field action table (fldact), the message pre-processing table (msgpre) and the message post-processing table (msgpost) comprise references to types of action selected from the following group of actions: database type of actions and logical type of actions including mathematical calculations, assignments, logical operations and conditional operations, and commands (Figure 10 [block 139]; column 16, lines 17-35).

48. With regards to claim 50, Samuel does not teach wherein the message definition table (msgdef) comprises an application field (appmain) for indicating whether a message received is a first message of an application and an application name field (appname) for referring to a name of the application, in order to define the application as a collection of data messages and their associated actions.

49. Cochinwala teaches wherein the message definition table (msgdef) comprises an application field (appmain) for indicating whether a message received is a first message of an application and an application name field (appname) for referring to a name of the application, in order to define the application as a collection of data messages and their associated actions (Figures 2, 3, 4; column 3, lines 33-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a application identifier in the message definition table. One would be motivated to include such a field, as it would aid in hastening the processing of the message, thereby minimizing the time the apparatus holds onto the message.

50. Concerning claim 51, Samuel teaches wherein the application is a distributed application distributed over a plurality of communication apparatuses (Abstract; column 12, line 61 to column 13, line 13).

51. With regards to claim 52, Samuel does not teach wherein the apparatus is arranged for requesting a new message definition from a sender if a message received refers to a message definition not present in its database (ILMDB), and receiving the new message definition from the sender and storing it in the message definition table (msgdef) in the database (ILMDB).

52. Cochinwala teaches wherein the apparatus is arranged for requesting a new message definition from a sender if a message received refers to a message definition not present in its database (ILMDB), and receiving the new message definition from the sender and storing it in the message definition table (msgdef) in the database (ILMDB) (column 3, lines 1-20). The combination of Samuel and Cochinwala is proper for at least the reasons mentioned above.

53. With regards to claim 53, Samuel does not teach arranged to interpret a previously unseen message and to create a new message definition entry in the database (ILMDB).

54. Cochinwala teaches arranged to interpret a previously unseen message and to create a new message definition entry in the database (ILMDB) (column 3, lines 1-20). The combination of Samuel and Cochinwala is proper for at least the reasons mentioned above.

55. With regards to claim 54, Samuel teaches wherein the processing means (ILMS) are arranged to either merge a message received with a designated HTML file or if the designated HTML file is not found by the processing means (ILMS), to create a default dynamic HTML file (column 16, lines 6-54; column 23, lines 8-49).

56. Concerning claim 55, Samuel teaches a system comprising a communication apparatus (SRV (m)) according to claim 28 and a terminal (ILMC) connected to the communication apparatus, the terminal comprising a terminal processor (1), a display unit (6) and input means (12, 13) for inputting data by a user, the communication apparatus being arranged for passing a message received to the terminal if the terminal is indicated in the message to be the destination address, and the terminal processor (1) is arranged to either merge the message with a designated HTML file or if the designated HTML file is not found by the terminal processor (1), to create a default dynamic HTML (column 16, lines 6-54; column 23, lines 8-49).

#### *Claim Objections*

57. Claims 28 through 56 are objected to because of the following informalities: the referenced claims are replete with spelling and grammar mistakes. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Conclusion*

58. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (703) 305-7704. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

Art Unit: 2131

59. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

60. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Christian La Forgia  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

clf

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100